

## REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated November 30, 2005. Claims 1 to 35 remain pending in the application, with Claims 33 to 35 having been withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner due to a restriction requirement. Of the claims currently under consideration, Claims 1, 10, 14, 15, 16 and 33 are independent. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

The Office Action entered a restriction requirement between Claims 1 to 32 (Group I) and Claims 33 to 35 (Group II), and entered a constructive election of the Group I claims. While Applicants confirm an election of the Group I claims, the restriction requirement is however, traversed. Specifically, it is noted that the restriction utilizes circular reasoning in that it merely states that the inventions are related as subcombinations and that each invention (I and II) has separate utility such as operating either independently or in combination with other subcombinations according to the particular limitations which characterize the other invention(s) as indicated above.” Applicant simply cannot determine what the separate utility is for each invention due to the circular reasoning. Moreover, the “as indicated above” does not help Applicant since the “above” fails to state what specifically each invention is directed to and merely lists a group of claims instead. Additionally, Applicants submit that both groups of claims are directed to common subject matter in the form of performing administrative operations of an initial setting at the top level, while the remaining levels have less than all of the higher level privileges. Accordingly, not only is the restriction requirement defective on its face, and therefore must either be withdrawn or properly rephrased, but the two groups of claims are directed to the same invention. Thus, the restriction requirement is traversed and the Examiner is

requested to reconsider and withdraw the requirement and to issue and action on the merits for all of the pending claims.

Claims 1, 10 and 33 were objected to for informalities that have been attended to by amendment. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 32 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,345,288 (Reed) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,799,198 (Huboi). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention relates to the configuration of a content providing application in a broadband printing service. According to the invention, three levels of configuration can be performed for the content providing application: a content service provider level, a multi-service operator level, and an end user level. The content service provider level is a top level in which content service providers perform an initial configuration of a parameter in the content providing application for providing a service. On a second level, multi-service operators configure the content providing application, where on the multi-service level the operators have the ability to perform many of the same administrative operations that the content service provider can perform, with the exception of the initial configuration of the parameter to provide the service. At the third level, end users subscribe to the service via their respective multi-service operator, and can configure the content providing application as to which content they want to receive from among the content configured by the multi-service operator. Thus, the invention provides a streamlines process for configuring a broadband printing service by providing three levels of configuration based on the three levels of configuration privileges.

Referring specifically to the claims, independent Claim 1 is a publication service interface between a content service provider application and a content providing application in a network printing system, comprising functionality for configuring the interface for the content service provider to interface with the content providing application on a first level, wherein the first level comprises content service provider administration properties, wherein the content service provider administration properties comprise an initial configuration operation for a parameter to provide a service provided by the content service provider, functionality for configuring the interface for a multi-service operator to interface with the content providing application on a second level, wherein the second level comprises multi-service level administration properties that comprise a portion of the content service provider administration properties which excludes the initial configuration operation for the parameter to provide the service provided by the content service provider application, and functionality for configuring the interface for an end user to interface with the content providing application on a third level, wherein the third level comprises end user level administration properties that comprise a portion of the multi-service provider administration properties.

Amended independent Claims 10 and 14 are method claims, while amended independent Claims 15 and 16 are system claims, each of which substantially corresponds to Claim 1.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the present invention, and in particular is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of configuring an interface for a content service provider application to interface with a content providing application on a first level, wherein the first level comprises content service provider administration properties

including an initial configuration operation for a parameter to provide a service provided by the service provider, and configuring the interface for a multi-service operator to interface with the content providing application on a second level comprising a portion of the content service provider administration properties which excludes the initial configuration operation for the parameter to provide the service provided by the service provider application.

Reed is merely seen to disclose that a provider computer and a consumer computer communicate directly with one another so that changes on the provider computer result in an updated version being transferred to the consumer computer. However, Reed fails to disclose or to suggest a content service provider being able to configure a service providing application on a first level, including the configuration for a parameter to provide a service provided by the content service provider. In this regard, the Office Action more or less admits this shortcoming of Reed since it merely alleges that Reed discloses “functionality for configuring the interface for the service provider (provider program 12 of Fig. 1) to interface with the content providing application (consumer program 22 of Fig. 1) on a first level, wherein the first level comprises service provider administration properties (administrator, col. 26, lines 23-31)” without even alleging any disclosure in Reed of the remaining portion of the claim element, namely “an initial configuration operation for a parameter to provide a service provided by the service provider.” Thus, the Office Action itself is defective in that it fails to address each element of the claims. Nonetheless, Reed is simply not seen to teach the foregoing features.

Huboi is not seen to add anything that, when combined with Reed, would have overcome the foregoing deficiencies. Specifically, Huboi is merely seen to disclose . However, any permissible combination of Reed and Huboi is not seen to disclose or to

suggest at least the feature of configuring an interface for a content service provider application to interface with a content providing application on a first level, wherein the first level comprises content service provider administration properties including an initial configuration operation for a parameter to provide a service provided by the service provider, and configuring the interface for a multi-service operator to interface with the content providing application on a second level comprising a portion of the content service provider administration properties which excludes the initial configuration operation for the parameter to provide the service provided by the service provider application.

In view of the foregoing, independent Claims 1, 10 and 14 to 16, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

Regarding Claims 33 to 35, while those claims have not received an action on the merits herein, they are nonetheless believed to be allowable for the reasons set forth in Applicants prior response.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Attorney for Applicants  
Edward A. Kmett  
Registration No. 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 109890v1